

Review comments:

This is a rather interesting study – but not totally complete (to this reviewer). As I was asked to review this MS – and not to edit it – I am not going to comment on the grammatical/formatting errors. I suggest that the authors consider submitting their manuscript to an editorial review service (there are many of them available) for editing.

The fruit that were used for the experiment were collected in a market. Apparently, these fruit have no particular name or identifying number. There is no picture provided, nor a detailed description. No specimen of it is available for observation. Thus, how can the research be duplicated? I suggest that the authors include (as a minimum) a photo of the mature fruit.

The authors indicate that the beneficial response is associated with *C. frutescens*. Yet, it is entirely possible that any beneficial effect may be restricted to the particular pepper variety that was utilized, or that other pepper varieties of this species, or of other species, may have a greater or no effect. Hence, it is important to identify the particular pepper variety that was used.

Dried fruit was utilized – yet no information was provided on how the fruit were dried or otherwise prepared. Drying effects the chemical composition. What is the composition of Growers mash?

This reviewer would very much have liked to see a dosage response curve or some correlation of the amount of *C. frutescens* ingested with changes in the measured parameters.

It seems likely that capsaicin was present in the samples of *C. frutescens*. Could this have affected the amount of food ingested by the various Groups? Can the authors provide data on the concentration of capsaicin present, or on the amount (weight) of food ingested by each of the test groups?

Table 1. This reviewer cannot understand why the normal control group (Group 1) was not included in the data analysis (comparison with Groups 1, 2 & 3). The comparison of treatment means only included Groups 2, 3 + 4. Why?

AST (IU/L) – why is there only a superscript b – and no others? What about a?

ALP (IU/L) – if these values are significantly different, they should be designated as such with superscript a, b, c, etc.

HDL (mg/dl) – if these values are not significantly different from each other, shouldn't they each be followed by the superscripted letter a?

Blood Glucose Pretreatment – two values are followed by superscript d. What happened to a, b and c?

Blood Glucose – where is the c?

All abbreviated terms (GGT, AST, ALP, etc.) should be defined in the title or in the footnote.

Perhaps the authors could mention the thermogenic properties associated with capsaicin.

Table 2. The footnote indicates that * denotes significance, but * does not appear anywhere in the Table. It would seem preferable for the authors to use a multiple range test to compare the means within columns (designate significant differences with a, b, c, etc.) as well as a t-test to compare means within Groups.

Turkey's post hoc test. Do the authors mean Tukey's?